

REMARKS

In the Office Action of September 7, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10-15, 25-29, 33-35, 37, and 52-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,480,860, issued to Monday, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,723, issued to Alavi et al. ("Alavi"), rejected claims 3-5 and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Monday in view Alavi, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,360, issued to Seo, and rejected claims 9 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Monday in view of Alavi, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,826,270, issued to Rutkowski. By this amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 25, 26, 52, and 54. Claims 1-10, 25-37, and 52-54 remain pending. Applicants traverse the rejections of claims 1-10, 25-37, and 52-54 for the following reasons.

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10-15, 25-29, 33-35, 37, and 52-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Monday, in view of Alavi. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Monday discloses a system for using a markup language, such as XML, to allow a user to access information in a database. Data requests are made from a markup language interface, such as an XML interface, and are then sent through a translator, or bridge, which parses the requests and sends them to an appropriate source (i.e. database) that contains the requested data. The source then retrieves the data and sends it back to the translator, which constructs an XML document with the retrieved data and sends it back to the requesting client. See col. 7, lines 24-67.

Alavi discloses a method and system for providing business intelligence information over a computer network via extensible markup language. See Alavi, Title.

The system of Alavi allows users to submit queries for certain financial information, and returns results of the query as a set of results, such as a table or report. See *id.* at col. 4, line 44 – col. 5, line 50.

M.P.E.P. § 2142 states, “[t]he examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness.” To establish *prima facie* obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), three requirements must be met. First, the applied references, taken alone or in combination, must teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claims. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 (8th ed. 2001). Second, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference(s) or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine or modify the reference(s) in a manner resulting in the claimed invention. Third, a reasonable expectation of success must exist. Moreover, each of these requirements must “be found in the prior art, and not be based on applicant’s disclosure.” M.P.E.P. § 2143 (8th ed. 2001).

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner has failed to show that the cited references teach or suggest every element recited in the claims. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* showing of obviousness. For example, claim 1 recites the following:

A computer based method for retrieving information for use by a requestor application, comprising the steps of:
 sending, by the requestor application, an information request to a master pivot program, the information request including document information related to a requested financing document that is part of a group of requested financing documents;
 retrieving the document information from the information request;
 retrieving document retrieval information from a configuration database as a function of the document information, the document retrieval information including a destination system;

sending the document retrieval information and the information request to a destination pivot program coupled to the destination system; retrieving the requested financing document from the destination system by the destination pivot program; and sending the requested financing document to the requestor application.

As conceded by the Examiner, Monday does not disclose, *inter alia*, that the retrieved financing document is part of a group of requested financing documents. See, e.g., Office Action at 4. The Examiner, however, cites Alavi as allegedly disclosing this feature. The Examiner equates the “set of results” generated by Alavi with the claimed “requested financing document that is part of a group of requested financing documents.” Applicants respectfully disagree with this interpretation.

Notably, Alavi discloses that a user may submit a query to view a “set of results” obtained from one or more databases. The set of results may be presented in the form of a “report,” which is shown in Fig. 1 and described in col. 5 as only a single report. See, e.g., Alavi, col. 5, lines 14-17 (“[t]he analytical engine 104 may process such queries to generate a quantitative report 110, which may include a table or other output indicating the results 114 extracted from the data storage devices...”). As such, the cited art neither teaches or suggests a group of requested financing documents, as recited in claim 1. Because the cited art does not support the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* showing of obviousness for claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claims 25 and 52, although of different scope from claim 1, also recite a requested financing document that is “part of a group of requested financing documents.” Thus claims 25 and 52 are distinguishable from the cited art for at least

similar reasons to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 25 and 52 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Dependent claims 2, 6-8, 10 and 53 depend from independent claim 1, while dependent claims 26-29, 33-35, 37, and 54 depend from independent claim 25. As explained above, independent claims 1 and 25 are distinguishable from the cited art. Therefore, dependent claims 2, 6-8, 10, 26-29, 33-35, 37, 53, and 54 are also distinguishable from the cited art for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with independent claims 1 and 25. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Dependent claims 3-5 and 30-32 were rejected as being unpatentable over Monday in view of Alavi and Seo, and dependent claims 9 and 36 were rejected as being unpatentable over Monday in view of Alavi and Rutkowski. However, as discussed above, Monday and Alavi fail to disclose certain claim features present in the pending independent claims. For example, neither Monday nor Alavi disclose or suggest a requested financing document that is part of a group of requested financing documents, as recited in claims 1, 25, and 52. Neither Seo, nor Rutkowski cure these deficiencies. Thus, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 3-5, 9, 30-32, and 36 for at least the same reasons described above.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-10, 25-37, and 52-54 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited art. Applicants therefore request the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

The Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and the related art with which Applicants do not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicants decline to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

If a telephone interview will expedite issuance of this application, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' representative, whose name and registration number appear below, to discuss any remaining issues.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 17, 2006

By: Bradley E. Edelman
Bradley E. Edelman
Reg. No. 57,648